REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, independent claim 1, along with dependent claims 2-3, 5 and 7 were rejected as being anticipated by SEILER (US 4,947,500). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Initially, Applicant points out that independent claim 1 is directed toward a mattress system, that includes a mattress, a mattress protector, and a control system. In contrast, SEILER is directed merely to the mattress itself, which is coupled with a control device. As such, the Examiner's alleged correspondence of components between SEILER and the present invention is not consistent with the ordinary meaning of Applicant's claimed components to one of skill in the art as will be understood from the following.

Applicant's independent claim 1 includes a mattress having a top surface and a bottom surface. As amended, a cavity arranged in the mattress is open at the top surface of the mattress. As shown, for example, in the preferred embodiments of Figures 3 and 4a-4b, the cavity 17 is open at the top surface of the mattress 14.

Moreover, Applicant's claim includes a mattress protector that covers the top surface of the mattress. The protector includes a first portion that extends into the cavity and a second portion that extends over an expandable cushion arranged in the cavity. Thus, Applicant's system includes a mattress and a

mattress protector, which are separate components.

In contrast, SEILER discloses a mattress formed of various parts,

including a base layer 1, an elastic frame layer 2, 3, and a cover layer 20. As is

clear from SEILER, these components form the mattress itself, not a mattress

and a mattress protector. Indeed, SEILER discloses that these components are

mutually glued together, thus forming the mattress (col. 3, lines 11-15 and 46-

48).

Since SEILER's components form the mattress itself, and because the

cover layer component 20 extends over the entire upper surface, the so-called

"core" in SEILER that allegedly corresponds to Applicant's claimed cavity is not

open at the upper surface as is required by Applicant's independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant's amended claim 1 is not anticipated by

SEILER. One skilled in the art would not consider SEILER's cover layer 20 a

"mattress protector" as claimed in the present invention. Rather, it is simply

part of the mattress itself.

Stated more generally, Applicant's invention is directed toward a mattress

system that allows for a bed pan to be raised and lowered into a cavity formed in

the mattress. To do so, the cavity must be open at the upper surface of the

mattress. In contrast, SEILER is directed toward the cycling of pressure into air

cushions arranged within a core of the mattress so as to cause movement of a

patient arranged on the cover layer 20 of the mattress. The present invention

Page 5 of 7

Serial No. 10/752,709

Amendment Dated: November 6, 2006

Reply to Office Action Mailed: May 5, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 010628.50474C3

and SEILER are directed toward two completely different objectives, and as such

the Examiner's equating of SEILER's components with those recited in

Applicant's amended claim 1 imparts an improper interpretation to Applicant's

claim language. One skilled in this art would not consider the cover layer 20 of

SEILER a mattress protector. Rather, one skilled in the art would consider it as

part of the mattress 20, just as is described in SEILER as forming a unitary

whole mattress (col. 3, line 48).

In view of the above, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentable over

SEILER. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are also submitted to be

patentable.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in

general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this

should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Page 6 of 7

Serial No. 10/752,709 Amendment Dated: November 6, 2006 Reply to Office Action Mailed: May 5, 2006 Attorney Docket No. 010628.50474C3

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #010628.50474C3).

Respectfully submitted,

November 6, 2006

Jeffrek D. Sanok

Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING LLP Intellectual Property Group P.O. Box 14300 Washington, DC 20044-4300 Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500 Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

JDS:pct